



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/578,291

02/05/2007

Tsvee Lapidot

30694/42021

6831

4743

7590

03/19/2010

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6357

EXAMINER

LONG, SCOTT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/19/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/578,291	Applicant(s) LAPIDOT ET AL.	
	Examiner SCOTT LONG	Art Unit 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/8/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16 and 26-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-25 and 41-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/8/2010 has been entered.

Claim Status

Claims 1-47 are pending. Claims 17, 23 and 25 are amended. Claims 41-47 are newly added. Claims 1-16 and 26-40 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 17-25 and 41-47 are under current examination.

Priority

This application claims benefit as a 371 of PCT/IL04/01018 (filed 11/08/2004). This application also claims benefit from foreign application ISRAEL 158868 (filed 11/13/2003). The instant application has been granted the benefit date, 13 November 2003, from the foreign application, ISRAEL 158868.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

35 USC § 112, 2nd

The rejection of claims 23 and 25 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in response to the applicant's arguments and/or claim amendments.

The applicant's claim amendments have been fully considered and are persuasive. The applicant has amended the claims to change the phrase "at least about" to "at least." There is perfect clarity regarding this word usage.

Therefore, the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection of claims 23 and 25 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

35 USC § 102

The rejection of claims 17-19 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sawada et al (J. Exp. Med., May 4, 1998; 187(9): 1439-1449) is withdrawn in response to the applicant's arguments and/or claim amendments.

The applicant's claim amendments have been fully considered and are persuasive. The applicant has amended the claims to include the limitation "human cord blood or bone marrow" stem cells. As the teachings of Sawada are directed to transgenic murine stem cells having human CXCR4, the examiner finds that Sawada does not anticipate the instant claims.

Therefore, the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection of claims 17-19 and 24-25 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sawada et al.

35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al (J. Exp. Med., May 4, 1998; 187(9): 1439-1449) in view of Lapidot et al. (Leukemia. October 2002; 16(1): 1992-2003) is withdrawn in response to the applicant's arguments and/or claim amendments.

The applicant's claim amendments have been fully considered and are persuasive. The applicant has amended the claims to include the limitation "human cord blood or bone marrow" stem cells. The teachings of Sawada are directed to transgenic murine stem cells having human CXCR4. The applicant argues that the cited art do not suggest generating transgenic human stem cells. The examiner finds the applicant's arguments convincing.

Therefore, the examiner hereby withdraws the rejection of claims 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et in view of Lapidot et al.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 1633

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Cartier-Lacave (WO03/047635, published 12 June 2003) and/or under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cartier-Lacave et al. (US2005/0163760).

Claim 17 is directed to an isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4 and exhibiting improved CXCR4 signaling capability in response to low and/or high concentration of SDF-1. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach hematopoietic progenitor or stem cell capable of expressing a polypeptide selected from...a mutated form of CXCR4 (parag.0033). Cartier-Lacave et al. teach that "capable of expressing a polypeptide" means genetically engineered cells comprising a nucleic acid of interest. The examiner interprets this language to mean a transgene encoding a mutant CXCR4. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach the natural ligand of CXCR4 is SDF-1 (parag.0088), thereby indicating that cells with this receptor are responsive. Cord blood stem cells and bone marrow stem cells comprise hematopoietic stem cells. The teachings of the specification encompasses muteins (i.e., mutants) of CXCR4. Furthermore, the specification indicates that muteins of CXCR4 are known to skilled artisans. Accordingly, the examiner concludes a skilled artisan would view Cartier-Lacave as anticipating claim 17.

Claim 18 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 17, wherein the stem cells are hematopoietic stem cells. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach

Art Unit: 1633

hematopoietic progenitor or stem cell capable of expressing a polypeptide selected from...a mutated form of CXCR4 (parag.0033).

Claim 19 is directed to the population of cells according to claim 17 or 18, being capable of differentiating towards the myeloid and erythroid lineages. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach a population of hematopoietic cells capable of differentiating towards the myeloid and erythroid lineages.

Claim 20 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 19, wherein the stem cells are CD34⁺ hematopoietic stem cells. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach a population of human hematopoietic cells which are CD34⁺.

Claim 21 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 17, wherein the immature progenitors are cells are CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach a population of hematopoietic cells which are CD34⁺/CD38⁻

Claim 22 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 21, wherein high amount of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells is about 1-5% of the population. Cartier-Lacave et al. teach a subpopulation of CD34⁺/CD38⁻ cells that contains more primitive HSC has been identified. Preferably, human hematopoietic cells are selected as being CD34⁺, CD38⁻ in combination. While CD38 is expressed on 95-99% of bone marrow derived CD34⁺ cells, the CD38⁻ fraction forms colonies with long term repopulating ability." (parag.0120). Accordingly, the examiner interprets the amount of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells to be about 1-5% of the population.

Claim 23 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 21, wherein high amount of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells is at least 3% of the population.

Art Unit: 1633

Cartier-Lacave et al. teach a subpopulation of CD34⁺/CD38⁻ cells that contains more primitive HSC has been identified. Preferably, human hematopoietic cells are selected as being CD34⁺, CD38⁻ in combination. While CD38 is expressed on 95-99% of bone marrow derived CD34⁺ cells, the CD38⁻ fraction forms colonies with long term repopulating ability.” (parag.0120). Accordingly, the examiner interprets the amount of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells to be at least 3% of the population.

Accordingly, Cartier-Lacave et al. anticipated the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1633

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 17-25 and 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peled et al. (Science. 1999; 283: 845-848) in view of Sawada et al (J. Exp. Med., May 4, 1998; 187(9): 1439-1449).

Claim 17 is directed to an isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4 and exhibiting improved CXCR4 signaling capability in response to low and/or high concentration of SDF-1.

Peled et al. teach "up-regulation of CXCR4 expression may be useful to improving engraftment of repopulating stem cells in clinical transplantation" (abstract). Further, Peled et al. teach human cord blood and bone marrow stem cells which have high expression of CXCR4. Additionally, Peled et al. cite Sawada as teaching "overexpression of human CD4 and CXCR4 receptors on murine CD4+ T cells led to enhanced homing of these cells to the murine bone marrow" (page 846, col.3). Peled et al. teach cells exhibiting improved CXCR4 signaling capability in response to low and/or high concentration of SDF-1.

Peled do not explicitly teach an isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4. However, Peled indicate

Art Unit: 1633

that human $CD34^{+}/CD38^{-/low}/CXCR4^{+}$ stem cells derived from cytokine cultured bone marrow or cord blood provide improved engraftment and repopulation. Further, Peled et al., by referencing Sawada, suggest that transgenic stem cells comprising a human CXCR4 gene are an alternative method of upregulating CXCR4 expression.

Sawada et al. teach a transgenic mouse comprising a human CXCR4 gene (page 1440, Materials). The transgenic mouse comprises a cell population comprising stem cells having the human CXCR4 gene. Sawada was in the possession of peripheral blood, cord blood, and bone marrow from a transgenic mouse comprising stem cells having a transgene encoding human CXCR4 (e.g., Figure 3). In particular, Sawada teaches an isolated population of transgenic murine bone marrow cells comprising a human transgene encoding CXCR4 (page 1443, col.2, Discussion). It is known in the art that bone marrow contains some hematopoietic stem cells.

Claim 18 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 17, wherein the stem cells are hematopoietic stem cells. Peled teach human $CD34^{+}/CD38^{-/low}/CXCR4^{+}$ stem cells. Peled teach that CXCR4⁺ is expressed on hematopoietic cells.

Claim 19 is directed to the population of cells according to claim 17 or 18, being capable of differentiating towards the myeloid and erythroid lineages. Peled teach population of cells capable of differentiating towards the myeloid and erythroid lineages (page 848, col. 1, parag.1).

Claim 20 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 19, wherein the stem cells are CD34⁺ hematopoietic stem cells. Peled teach human CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low}/CXCR4⁺ stem cells.

Claim 21 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 17, wherein the immature progenitors are cells are CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells. Peled teach human CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low}/CXCR4⁺ stem cells.

Claim 22 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 21, wherein high amount of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells is about 1-5% of the population. Peled teach human CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low}/CXCR4⁺ stem cells. Peled teach this limitation (see Fig.4A).

Claim 23 is directed to the isolated population of stem cells according to claim 21, wherein high amount of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells is at least 3% of the population. Peled teach human CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low}/CXCR4⁺ stem cells. Peled teach this limitation (see Fig.4A). Furthermore, as "the population" is not a pure population of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells, various methods of preparing can produce differing percentages of CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells. The percentages of these markers in a population of cells are not a patentable distinction. Therefore, the examiner concludes that an isolated population of stem cells which have some percentage CD34⁺/CD38^{-/low} cells would be deemed obvious by a skilled artisan.

Claims 24-25 are directed to limitations which affect the concentration of SDF-1, which can be used to stimulate the claimed isolated stem cell population. These claims do not further limit the structure of the isolated stem cell population of claim 1; rather

Art Unit: 1633

they describe a characteristic of the cells under certain manipulated conditions.

However, Peled teach that various concentrations of SDF-1 can be used to stimulate the claimed isolated stem cell population (see page 846, Fig.2 and page 848, reference 23).

Claims 41-47 combine limitations from claims 22-25, regarding the % population and concentrations of SDF-1. These are obvious variants of the teachings taught by the cited art.

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Peled and Sawada to make an isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4.

The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of the cited art because Peled suggest that isolated stem cells with upregulated expression of CXCR4 provide improved engraftment of repopulating stem cells. Peled and Sawada indicate that transgenic stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4 provide enhanced homing of these cells to bone marrow. It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute a transgene encoding CXCR4 (as suggested by Sawada) for cytokine induction of CXCR4 (as taught by Peled) in an isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells.

The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to substitute one known, equivalent element for another to obtain predictable results. The claimed

Art Unit: 1633

isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow of stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4 would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. In the instant case, it would have been obvious to substitute CXCR4 transgene overexpression in isolated human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells for cytokine induced CXCR4 overexpression in isolated human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells because Peled et al teach the equivalency of the methods of CXCR4 overexpression for producing stem cells with enhanced homing to bone marrow.

The skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of success in combining the teachings of Peled et al. and Sawada et al. because Sawada teach successfully making transgenic murine stem cells having a human CXCR4 gene. Therefore, making transgenic human stem cells having a human CXCR4 gene would likely be successful. There is nothing of record or in the art that suggests this would be difficult.

Therefore the isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow stem cells comprising a transgene encoding CXCR4 as taught by Peled et al. in view of Sawada et al. would have been *prima facie* obvious over the isolated population of human cord blood or bone marrow of stem cells of the instant application.

Art Unit: 1633

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "the immature primitive progenitors" in line 2.

Amended claim 17 has cancelled the limitation "immature primitive progenitors." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Examiner Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Long** whose telephone number is **571-272-9048**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph Woitach** can be reached on **571-272-0739**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Scott Long/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1633